



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Erden eine Sau*) upon the latter's halting expression (*der nicht zwen tag lang im Paradies bleiben mögen . . . und hat inn seiner wohnung nicht bleiben können*). (Cf. p. ccxc.) In comparison with this apposite consideration Milchsack's further argument (p. cclxxxviii) that in the two expressions: *bist du zu einer Sau worden* and *verwandelt in ein saw* only two words (*ein, saw*) are actually identical, and that the derivation of the one from the other is hence improbable, seems to me weak and valueless. This thumb-rule reasoning would easily disprove his own conclusions as to the relation of the chap-book to Milichius, or even to Schedel. Its controversial character, hostile to the scientific spirit, is obvious. Milchsack gives on p. cclxxxiv a conspectus of verbal correspondences between the *Tischrede* on the one hand, and the *Faustbuch* and Lerchheimer on the other. Of ten places where the three fail to tally with each other, the *Faustbuch* agrees with the *Tischrede* in eight, Lerchheimer in only three instances. That the chap-book author should have copied Lerchheimer and have accidentally hit upon the exact phraseology of Luther five times in one anecdote, at points where his supposed original was either misleading or silent, is to my mind extremely improbable. Not equally convincing is Milchsack's attempt to derive Lerchheimer from the *Faustbuch*. His rejection (p. cclxxxvi) of the possibility that Lerchheimer followed the *Tischrede* directly seems to me entirely unwarranted by the internal evidence. I regard, therefore, as of little value the brief comparison (footnote, pp. ccxc, ccxc) of the Frankf. print, S, with the Wolfenbüttel Ms., W, intended to show that Lerchheimer must have copied neither of these nor their original, but rather an independent copy of that original.

Without having attempted an exhaustive comparison of S with W, I have noted some points that indicate the earlier origin of W: 1. The *Vorrede* of S, when compared with that of W, seems the substitute of an editor not content with the rather mild didacticism of the latter, and fairly bristles with guides for the protection of the unwary reader. (Cf. the triple quotation of Bible texts on the first two pages.) The preface of W is apparently too descriptive and too historical,—too liable, therefore, in the eyes of the Frankfurt editor to mislead the public. As a remedy he has reduced the historical data to the minimum, substituted an exclamatory sermon by way of warning, and characterized Mephistophiles on the third page of the *Vorrede* as

*einen bösen verfluchten Lügen und Mordtgeist der in der Warheit und Gerechtigkeit nicht bestanden, unnd seiner Sünde halben auss dem Himmel in den Abgrund der Hellen verstoßen worden, mit Leib unnd Seel, zu zeitlicher unnd ewiger Verdammuss zu eygen ergeben.*

These words contradict Mephistophiles' own description of his estate and frame of mind, (W 24, 32. 35, 32. 36, 27. 41, 27. 56, 10) and

certainly seem inspired by the fear of allowing the assertions in the body of the book to go unchallenged in the preface. Religious zeal furnished the Frankfurt print with a preface different from that of W 2. The anecdotal features of the Frankfurt preface seem to be terse reductions of the more circumstantial and clumsier equivalents of W (cf. the Goldturm snake story: W 5, 25 sq; S bottom of p. 7 of *Vorr.*). Also the career and fate of Zoroaster: W 7, 21 sq; S middle of p. 7 of *Vorr.*). 3. S abounds in stylistic improvements as compared with W that continually suggest an editor who consciously avoids the crudities of his original (cf. the reversion in S of the chapter sequence, 60, 61, and the entire omission of chapter 62, as contained in W, to render Faust's life with Grecian Helen the climax of this part of the work). Sundry other omissions and substitutions, large and small, that cannot safely be studied without access to the Wolfenbüttel Ms. or to an adequate critical apparatus, seem in line with my conviction that W is considerably older than S.

Milchsack's chapters upon *Tendenz* and *Composition* are manifestly incomplete, and were published in this fragmentary condition at the instance of the impatient printer. Judgment as to their value should be suspended until the appearance of their supplements in the second part of Milchsack's studies. My desire for an early appearance of these supplements is stimulated by the realization of the great importance of what he seems to me already to have clearly proven: 1. What Meyer had asserted without proof in his *Nürnberg Faustgeschichten*: that oral and written tradition concerning Faust or still earlier magicians, is the basis of the chap-book in no such sense as has hitherto been supposed; 2. that the chap-book is a *Zauberroman* whose plot is the invention of the Anonymous. 3. That the historical, geographical, and cosmological features of the work owe a large substantial and verbal debt to Schedel's *Cronick*. 4. That Milichius' *Zauberteufel* was studied carefully by the chap-book author, literally quoted in a number of instances, made to yield the ground-work of numerous chapters, phraseologically the work of the Anonymous, and to lend in the person of Simon Magus, and by inference that of his companion, Helena, the outlines of the career of Faust, and, 5. that Lerchheimer's *Christlich Bedencken* can no longer be regarded as the prototype of a portion of the *Faustbuch*.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

University of Chicago.

#### CORRECTION.

MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xii, p. 238, footnote: Instead of "The greek letter  $v=u$ ," read " $v=\overset{\circ}{u}$ ." The ring over the  $u$  was broken off in a few numbers while passing through the press.